

U.S.S.N. 10/633,240

Remarks

Applicants thank the Examiner for kindly indicating that claims 41-42 are allowable.

The Specification and claim 2 have been amended pursuant to the Examiner's helpful suggestions.

Claims 1, 5, 10, 11, 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Rabuse et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,437,362).

Rabuse et al. disclose a roll of adhesive tape that includes an antistatic coating on the edge of the roll. The antistatic coating consist of a soft plastic or a waxy organic composition including an ionic compound that is capable of providing adequate ionic antistatic conductivity.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of detackifying an edge face of a roll of pressure sensitive adhesive tape. The method includes contacting an edge face of the roll of tape with a non-free radically curable composition that includes water and a film-forming agent, and drying the composition. Rabuse et al. do not teach contacting the edge face of a roll of pressure sensitive adhesive tape with a non-free radically curable composition. Rather, Rabuse et al. disclose contacting the edge of a strip of pressures sensitive adhesive tape with an antistatic coating. The antistatic coating of Rabuse et al. is applied prior to winding the strip of tape up into a roll. In particular, Rabuse et al. disclose that knives can slit and simultaneously coat one or both edges of a tape (see, Rabuse et al. col. 4, lines 4-7 and the Example). The tape is then wound into rolls. Rabuse et al. thus fail to teach each and every element of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) cannot stand and requests that it be withdrawn.

Claims 5, 10, 11, 16 and 17 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are distinguishable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Rabuse et al. for at least the same reasons set forth above in distinguishing claim 1.

Claims 2-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Rabuse et al. in view of Swanson et al. (WO 00/78882). Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1. The rejection of

U.S.S.N. 10/633,240

claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Rabuse et al. in view of Swanson et al. is based on the above-refuted premise that Rabuse et al. teach the method of claim 1. Since this premise has been refuted, Applicant submits that the rejection of claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Rabuse et al. in view of Swanson et al. cannot stand and requests that it be withdrawn.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Rabuse et al. The rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Rabuse et al. is based on the above-refuted premise that Rabuse et al. teach the method of claim 1. Since this premise has been refuted, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Rabuse et al. cannot stand and requests that it be withdrawn.

Claims 7-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Rabuse et al. in view of Hawley's. The rejection of claims 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Rabuse et al. in view of Hawley's is based on the above-refuted premise that Rabuse et al. teach the method of claim 1. Since this premise has been refuted, Applicant submits that the rejection of claims 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Rabuse et al. in view of Hawley's cannot stand and requests that it be withdrawn.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Rabuse et al. in view of Koshar et al. The rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Rabuse et al. in view of Koshar et al. is based on the above-refuted premise that Rabuse et al. teach the method of claim 1. Since this premise has been refuted, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Rabuse et al. in view of Koshar et al. cannot stand and requests that it be withdrawn.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Rabuse et al. in view of Larimore et al. (U.S. 4,751,108). The rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Rabuse et al. in view of Larimore et al. is based on the above-refuted premise that Rabuse et al. teach the method of claim 1. Since this premise has been refuted, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Rabuse et al. in view of Larimore et al. cannot stand and requests that it be withdrawn.

Claims 14-15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Rabuse et al. in view of Kantner et al. (U.S. 5,536,768). The rejection of claims 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Rabuse et al. in view of Kantner et al. is based on the above-refuted premise that

U.S.S.N. 10/633,240


Rabuse et al. teach the method of claim 1. Since this premise has been refuted, Applicant submits that the rejection of claims 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Rabuse et al. in view of Kantner et al. cannot stand and requests that it be withdrawn.

There being no further rejections of record, Applicants submit that the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested. If the next action is other than allowance, Applicant respectfully requests a teleconference interview.

Please charge any additional fees owing or credit any over payments made to Deposit Account No. 501,171.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 4, 2005



Allison Johnson
Reg. No. 36,173

Allison Johnson, P.A.
2925 Dean Parkway, Suite 300
Minneapolis, MN 55416
Telephone (612) 925-8371
Facsimile (612) 925-8372